

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STEPHEN GARCIA,

Plaintiff,

v.

GEORGE ROBINSON, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:24-cv-2532-TLN-SCR

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

Plaintiff Stephen Garcia is proceeding pro se in this action, which was referred to the undersigned in accordance with Local Rule 302(c)(21) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). On September 18, 2024, Plaintiff filed a complaint and a motion to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”). ECF Nos. 1 and 2. On December 3, 2024, this Court screened the complaint per the screening process required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) and found the complaint was deficient in that it did not comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8. ECF No. 3. The complaint did not contain a short and plain statement setting forth the basis for federal jurisdiction or showing Plaintiff’s entitlement to relief. ECF No. 3 at 3-4. The Court’s order provided in relevant part that Plaintiff shall have 30 days to file an amended complaint, and such amended complaint “must include a sufficient jurisdictional statement and comply with Rule 8.” *Id.* at 5. The Order warned that

1 failure to comply may result in a recommendation that the action be dismissed. *Id.* More than 30
2 days have passed, and Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint.

3 Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that **Plaintiff shall show cause, in**
4 **writing, within 14 days**, why the failure to file an amended complaint should not result in a
5 recommendation that this case be dismissed based on lack of jurisdiction and/or for failure to state
6 a claim. Plaintiff may respond by filing an amended complaint that complies with the Court's
7 prior order. If Plaintiff fails to respond, the court will recommend dismissal of this case.

8 SO ORDERED.

9 DATED: January 13, 2025

10
11 
12 SEAN C. RIORDAN
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28